REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Continued examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 5, 14, 19, 21, 25, 66, 71, 77, 82, 83, 85, and 99 have been amended. Claims 2-3, 7, 13, 15, 20, 22-23, 28-65, 69-70, 72, 74-75, 81, 88-91, 96-98, and 100-104 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new matter has been introduced into the application.

The specification has been amended to update the current status of the priority claim and in accordance with that submitted in the Declaration filed on January 25, 2002.

Independent claims 1, 5, 14, and 19 have all been amended to include the limitation of token key pairing. The token key has been more distinctly claimed to point out that the token key is physically separable from the base station and from the body electronics unit. Claims 2, 7, 15, and 20, which claim the token key, are now incorporated, respectively, into independent claims 1, 5, 14, and 19.

Prior claims 2 and 20, which are now incorporated into claims 1 and 19, respectively, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segalowitz in view of either Olejniczak or De La Huerga. The Olejniczak and De La Huerga references were cited by the examiner, in combination with Segalowitz, to supply the missing token key element in rejecting prior dependent claims 2 and 20. The combination of Segalowitz and Olejniczak or De La Huerga does not teach all of the limitations of the invention as now claimed. The Olejniczak and De La Huerga references require the two units that are being paired to be physically mated to effect the pairing. The present invention utilizes a token key, which does not require a physical connection of the units to be paired. The token key is physically removed and alternately plugged into a mating slot in each of the two units to effect pairing.

This enables a patient that is wearing the body electronics unit to be paired with a base station without having to remove the body electronics unit. Thus, a patient can be moved from one location to another, while still wearing the body electronics unit and chest assembly, and be connected to a new base station unit and corresponding monitor by re-pairing the units. The pairing method is claimed in claims 82 and 83.

Prior claim 7, which is now incorporated into claim 5, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segalowitz in view of Minoz and in further view of either Olejniczak or De La Huerga. The argument above with regards to Olejniczak and De La Huerga applies here.

Prior claim 15, which is now incorporated into claim 14, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Segalowitz in view of Minoz and price and in further view of either Olejniczak or De La Huerga. The argument above with regards to Olejniczak and De La Huerga applies here.

Independent claims 21, 66, and 99 have been amended to include the limitation that the body electronics unit is activated (turned-on) when the chest assembly is plugged into the unit. The body electronics unit will only function after a chest assembly is plugged-in thereby saving battery life by eliminating the chance of accidentally turning-on the power to the unit.

Prior claim 22, which is now incorporated into claim 21, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minoz in view of Delvin. The combination of Minoz and Delvin does not teach all of the limitations of the invention as now claimed. The Devlin reference discloses the use of a cable set having a coded connector that plugs into a digital signal converter. The signal converter recognizes the connector code, and the monitor is thus configured according to the recognized code. However, there is no teaching that the connector

activates the signal conditioner. In fact, to be able to read the connector code, the signal converter must be powered-up.

Prior claim 70, which is now incorporated into claim 66, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delvin in view of Price in further view of Minoz. The argument above with regards to Delvin applies to claim 66 and to claim 99. Claim 66 further claims a sense pin as the activation element, which is not taught in any of the cited references.

Applicants' requests that the independent claims above, and all of their dependent claims, be allowed. Should the Examiner believe that a conversation with Applicants' representative would be useful in the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to call Applicants' representative.

A one month extension of time and request for continued examination are requested. A Petition for one month extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) is submitted herewith. A Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. § 1.114 is submitted herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account Number 502725.

Dated: 3/2/2005

Respectfully submitted,

Rick F. Comoglio
Registration No. 40,963
rcomoglio@lfiplaw.com

LOTT AND FRIEDLAND, PA
One East Broward Blvd., Suite 1609
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
954-315-5044 (main)
954-315-5045 (fax)